



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,662	11/30/2001	Lawrence W. Catchpole	10873-35881	2588
24728	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
MORRIS MANNING & MARTIN LLP 1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER 3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE ATLANTA, GA 30326-1044			DIVECHA, KAMAL B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2151		

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/002,662	CATCHPOLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-42 and 115-128 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-42 and 115-128 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20011130</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-42 and 115-128 are pending in this Office Action.

In response to restriction/election requirement mailed on July 27, 2005, applicant respectfully elected claims of group I (claims 1-42 and 115-128) for prosecution in the present application, without traverse, and without prejudice to the filing of one or more divisional patent applications to the non-elected subject matter.

Examiner therefore withdraws the claims of group II (claims 43-78) and claims of group III (claims 79-114) from being examined and presents the claims of group I (claims 1-42 and 115-128) for examination.

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for a priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) of a U. S. provisional patent application no. 60/250,300.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/30/2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

The lengthy drawing has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the drawings.

Specification

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-42 and 115-128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “the request” in line 7-8 and 15-17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2-3 recites the similar limitations in the claim and therefore they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 12 is indefinite because the recited limitation “for each request for a resource predetermined to have sensitive input fields, first deleting data from such input fields before recording the content of the request” in line 35-37, is unclear. It is unclear what the resource predetermined to have sensitive input fields are.

Claims 24-25 recites the limitation “click stream” in line 13-17. The phrase click stream is unclear and would be indefinite to the one of ordinary skilled in the art.

Claims 115-117 recites the similar limitation as in claims 1-3. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-3.

Claim 116 recites the limitation “primary and subordinate http requests” in line 17. The phrase subordinate and primary requests are unclear.

Claim 116 recites the limitation “for each request”, “each respective request” in line 20, 25-30. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Please note the listing above is provided as an example and is not the exhaustive listing of all the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection errors. The claims contain numerous amount of 35 USC 112, second paragraph errors. Applicant is advised to correct other errors as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 128 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 128 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of general definition of the “computer-readable medium”, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments and is defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g floppy disks, CD-ROMS, ROM, RAM, etc.) and intangible embodiments (e.g. optical, acoustical, or other form of propagated signals carrier waves such as infrared signals, digital signals, etc.). Due to applicant’s failure to disclose any tangible embodiment in the disclosure that will enable and perform the functions of the present invention, wherein the claim is not defined and limited to statutory subject matter, claim is defined as non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-10, 15, 17-20, 22, 24-26, 115-118, 121, 123-126 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ingrassia, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia, U. S. Patent No. 6,035,332).

As per claim 3, Ingrassia discloses a method for monitoring browser interactions with a server arrangement for a website, comprising the steps of: capturing information regarding http requests received from browsers at the server arrangement and corresponding http responses sent to the browsers from the server arrangement, the information including: for each request, content of the request, a time of receipt for the request, a browser identification associated with the request, and an entity identification associated with a uniform resource locator related to each such request; identifying sessions for each pair of browserID and related to the URL associated with the EntityID that are received at the server arrangement within a predetermined period of time, and corresponding responses; assigning a session identification for each identified session; and recording in a database for each identified session the sessionId for such session in association with, the content of each respective request in the identified session, the content of each respective response in the identified session, a chronological order of the requests in the

identified session, and the browserID and entityID for which the session is identified (fig. 1, fig. 6, col. 3L65 to col. 7 L45, col. 9 L30 to col. 10 L55).

As per claim 4, Ingrassia discloses the process of recording in the database for each identified session the chronological order of the requests in the identified session comprises recording in the database the time of receipt for each request in the identified session (fig. 6).

As per claim 5, Ingrassia discloses the process of identifying sessions includes identifying requests, each of which is received at the server arrangement within a predetermined period of time of another such request, and responses corresponding to such requests (col. 9 L50 to col. 10 L55).

As per claim 6, Ingrassia discloses the process of identifying sessions further includes identifying a request as being chronologically the last request of the session if the request is for a resource predetermined to signify an end of a session (col. 8 L28-55 and fig. 6).

As per claim 7, Ingrassia discloses the process of obtaining a user identification associated with a particular request, and recording the userid in the database in association with the sessionid of the particular request (fig. 6).

As per claim 8, Ingrassia discloses the process wherein the userid is obtained from an application server (col. 12 L51-65 and fig. 1 item #134, fig. 2 item #144).

As per claim 9, Ingrassia discloses the process of obtaining an application session identification associated with a particular request, and recording the application session id in the database in association with the sessionid of the particular request (fig. 6).

As per claim 10, Ingrassia discloses the process wherein the application session id is obtained from an application server (col. 12 L51-65 and fig. 1 item #134, fig. 2 item #144).

As per claim 15, Ingrassia discloses a computer network for performing the process comprising a server arrangement disposed for communication with a browser whereat said step of capturing is performed and a database whereat said step of recording is performed (fig. 1).

As per claim 17, Ingrassia discloses a computer network wherein said server arrangement comprises a single server (fig. 1).

As per claim 18, Ingrassia discloses a computer network wherein said server arrangement comprises a plurality of servers (fig. 1-3).

As per claim 19, Ingrassia discloses a computer network wherein capturing information is performed at each server of said plurality of servers (fig. 1 and col. 5 L55 to col. 6 L65).

As per claim 20, Ingrassia discloses a computer network wherein computer network further comprises a collection component (fig. 1 and col. 5 L55 to col. 6 L65).

As per claim 22, Ingrassia discloses a computer network wherein step of identifying sessions is performed at collection component (col. 6 L36-55).

As per claim 24, Ingrassia discloses the process of identifying each request for which a corresponding response is of a content type representing part of a click stream and recording in the database whether a recorded request is so identified (fig. 6, fig. 10, col. 5 L55 to col. 6 L65).

As per claim 25, Ingrassia discloses the process of identifying each request for which a corresponding response is of a content type representing part of a click stream is performed at the server (col. 5 L55 to col. 6 L65).

As per claim 26, Ingrassia discloses the process wherein the content type is text/html (col. 1 L31-47, col. 5 L55 to col. 6 L65).

As per claim 116, Ingrassia discloses the process for monitoring a browser's interactions with a server arrangement, comprising the steps of: capturing information regarding primary and subordinate http requests received at the server arrangement and corresponding primary and subordinate http responses sent from the server arrangement, the information including, for each request, content of the request and a time of receipt for the request, and content of the response corresponding to each such requests; identifying sessions, each comprising requests received at the server arrangement and corresponding responses (col. 14 L17-18); assigning a session identification for each identified session; recording in a database for each identified session the sessionid for such session in association with, the content of each respective request in the identified session, the content of each respective response in the identified session, and chronological order of the requests in the identified session (fig. 1, fig. 6, col. 3L65 to col. 7 L45, col. 9 L30 to col. 10 L55); and for a particular sessionid, parsing the content of the primary requests recorded in the database in association with such sessionid to identify URL contained therein (fig. 8A-8C, fig. 10, col. 11 L30 to col. 12 L50); and taking a predefined action in response to the recognition of a predetermined pattern of identified URLs contained with the content of the primary requests (col. 12 L51 to col. 14 L35 and fig. 8A-8C, fig. 10).

As per claim 118, Ingrassia discloses the process wherein the predefined pattern comprises a chronological sequence of Urls (fig. 6 and fig. 10).

As per claims 1-2, 115, 117, 121, 123-126 and 128, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 3-10, 15, 17-20, 22, 24-26, 116 and 118. Therefore claims 121, 123-126 and 128 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 3-10, 15, 17-20, 22, 24-26, 116 and 118.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 13-14, 21 and 28-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrassia, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia, U. S. Patent No. 6,035,332) in view of Epstein (U. S. Patent No. 6,453,416 B1).

As per claim 13, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the database includes contents of previous responses recorded in association with respective hash values therefor, and the process of calculating a hash value for the content of a current response and when the calculated hash value matches none of the recorded hash values, recording the content of the current response in the database, and in association therewith, recording the calculated hash value in the database.

Epstein, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the process of calculating a hash value for the document (request, response, content etc) and comparing the calculated hash value with the recorded hash values and recording the document in the server with the calculated hash value (col. 1 L12-27, col. 5 L43 to col. 6 L49, fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in view of Epstein in order to calculate hash value, compare the calculated hash value and store or recording the content or the document, since Epstein teaches the process of calculating a hash value, comparing the hash values and recording the documents in the server.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have provided a means for manifesting the user's approval of the document (request, response, etc.) and/or would have provided a means for verification of the documents (Epstein, col. 1 L12-27).

As per claim 14, Ingrassia discloses the process of recording the sessionid for each identified session in association with the content of each respective response in the identified session (fig. 6), however Ingrassia does not disclose the process of linking the sessionid with the recorded hash value for the content of each response in such identified session. Epstein discloses a memory containing respective fields in a data structure, for storing user Ids, public keys, documents and associated digital signatures (hash, col. 6 L39-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in view of Epstein, in order to provide a linking between the sessionids and recorded hash values, since Epstein teaches the process of linking userids in a data structure with the associated documents and hash values. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 13.

As per claim 21, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process of calculating a hash value for a response captured at that server; when calculated hash value matches one of the reference hash values, forwarding from that server to said collection component the calculated hash value but not the content of the response and when the calculated hash value matches none of the reference hash values, forwarding from that server to said collection component the calculated hash value for the content of the response and the content of the response. Epstein discloses the process of calculating a hash value for the document (request, response, content etc) and comparing the calculated hash value with the recorded hash values and recording the document in the server with the calculated hash value (col. 1 L12-27, col. 5 L43 to col. 6 L49, fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in view of Epstein, in order to calculate a hash value for a response, compare the calculated hash value with the reference hash values, and take an appropriate action based on the comparison, since Epstein teaches the process of calculating a hash value, comparing a hash value with the reference hash values and storing the document. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 13.

As per claim 28, Ingrassia discloses the process of retaining each response within a respective record of the database (fig. 6, it also includes sessionid, browserid, entityid), however Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process of calculating a hash value for each such database record and the encrypting the calculated hash value with a private key of a public-private key pair. Epstein explicitly discloses the process of calculating a hash value and then encrypting the calculated hash value with a private key of a public-private key pair (fig. 2 and

col. 5 L42 to col. 6 L11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Epstein as stated above with Ingrassia in order to calculate a hash value for each database record and then encrypting the calculated hash value with a private key. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 13.

As per claim 29, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the public-private key pair is for an entity. Epstein explicitly discloses the process wherein the public-private key pair is for an entity (col. 1 L10-30, col. 4 L24-35). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Epstein as stated above with Ingrassia in order to provide a public-private key for en entity. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 13.

As per claim 30, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the public-private key pair is for a user of a browser to which the record pertains. Epstein discloses the process wherein the public-private key pair is for a user of a browser (col. 1L10-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Epstein as stated above with Ingrassia in order to provide a public-private key pair for a user of a browser to which the record pertains. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons as set forth in claim 13.

As per claims 31-42, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 13-14, 21 and 28-30. Therefore, claims 31-42 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 13-14, 21 and 28-30.

5. Claims 11, 12, 119-120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ingrassia, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia, U. S. Patent No. 6,035,332).

As per claim 11, Ingrassia discloses the process of identifying sessions (col. 15 L10-25) and the process of monitoring all active sessions (col. 11 L50 to col. 12 L35), however Ingrassia does not disclose the process of discarding responses and requests corresponding to such response, each of which has a content type matching a predetermined content type. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in order to discard or delete before identifying the session, responses, each of which has a content type matching a predetermined content type and each request corresponding to such response. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that only critical session history are captured and stored.

As per claim 12, Ingrassia discloses the process of updating the name fields on the respective web pages and storing the URL and update of name field into the data list (col. 15 L1 to col. 17 L11), however Ingrassia does not disclose the process of, for each request for a resource predetermined to have sensitive input fields, first deleting data from such input fields before said step of recording the content of the request. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in order to delete data from resource having sensitive input fields before storing or recording the content of the request, since Ingrassia teaches the process of changing the name field on a webpage and then storing the web page in the database. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated in order to record only critical data associated with the web page.

As per claim 119, Ingrassia discloses the process of notifying or informing a customer service representative of the current session Id (col. 12 L7-50), however Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process of notifying a CSR of the recognition of the predetermined pattern. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in order to notify the CSR of the recognized of the predetermined pattern, since Ingrassia teaches a means for informing a CSR. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would enabled a CSR to take an appropriate action.

As per claim 120, Ingrassia discloses the process of assigning identification corresponding to URLs and recording the identification in the database (fig. 6), however Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process of assigning a pattern identification corresponding to the URL pattern recognized and recording the pattern id in the database. But it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in order to assign the pattern identification corresponding to the url pattern recognized and recording the pattern id in the database. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would enable tracking and identification of the URL pattern.

6. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ingrassia, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia, U. S. Patent No. 6,035,332) in view of “Official Notice”.

As per claim 27, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose the process wherein the process of recording in the database whether a response recorded in the database is so identified comprises setting a flag maintained in the database in association with the request. Official Notice is taken

to show that the process of setting a flag maintained in the database to indicate an event is obvious and well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ingrassia in order to set a flag in the database to indicate the whether a response recorded in the database is so identified. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have provided a means for indicating whether a document is identified or not.

7. Claims 16, 23, 122 and 127 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingrassia, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia, U. S. Patent No. 6,035,332) in view of DeBettencourt et al. (hereinafter DeBettencourt, U. S. Patent No. 6,279,001 B1).

As per claim 16, Ingrassia does not explicitly disclose a system comprising a firewall disposed between server arrangement and a database.

DeBettencourt, from the same field of endeavor discloses a system comprising a firewall connected between any two components in the network (fig. 11B-11C and col. 21 L60 to col. 22 L36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of DeBettencourt as stated above with Ingrassia in order to include a firewall between server and database. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because an ideal firewall allows point-to-point traffic to be initiated by either component (DeBettencourt, col. 21 L60-65).

As per claims 23, 122 and 127, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 16. Therefore claims 23, 122 and 127 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 16.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Shelton et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,418,471 B1, Method for recording and reproducing the browsing activities of an individual web browser.
- b. Bauersfeld et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,189,024 B1, Browsing session recording playback and editing system for generating user defined paths and allowing users to mark the importance of items in the paths.
- c. Anupam et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,862,330.
- d. Haitsuka et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,366,298 B1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex schedule 8 hr days (10.00am-6.30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KD
September 1, 2005.


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER